

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR  
&  
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.T.SANKARAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 24TH OCTOBER 2007 / 2ND KARTHIKA 1929

RP.No. 922 of 2007()

-----  
AGAINST THE ORDER IN RCR.254/2007 Dated 02/08/2007  
.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/REVISION PETITIONER  
-----

C.E.CHAKKUNNY, S/O.ALIAS,  
SHOP.NO.10/1023, S.M.STREET,  
NAGARAM AMSOM AND DESOM, KOZHIKODE.

BY ADV. SRI.V.V.SURENDRAN  
SRI.P.A.HARISH

RESPONDENT: RESPONDENT  
-----

P.RAMAA DEVI, W/O.MOHANDAS RADHAKRISHNAN  
RESIDING AT REMYA, KOZHIPPURAM COMPOUND,  
PANNIANKARA, KOZHIKODE.

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION  
ON 22/10/2007, THE COURT ON 24/10/2007 PASSED THE  
FOLLOWING:

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR &

K.T.SANKARAN, JJ.

-----  
R.P. NO.922 OF 2007 IN

R.C.R. NO.254/2007  
-----

Dated 24<sup>th</sup> October, 2007.

ORDER

Balakrishnan Nair, J.

The petitioner is the review petitioner. He seeks review of the order, on the ground that the decision rendered by this Court, relying on Exts.A5 and A6 documents, which are the certified extracts of the register concerning assessment of property tax of the Corporation of Kozhikode, is vitiated. The petitioner has produced Annexures-A1 to A10 documents, which would show that the rooms in his building called “Manoj Building” as well as the petition schedule room are all vacant as per the register maintained by the Corporation. So, it is evident that those registers do not reflect the correct factual position. The petitioner further points out that the order under review was rendered mainly relying on those documents.

2. We notice that the availability of vacant rooms in the possession of the petitioner was found, based on several materials. This Court had

noticed that the petitioner has failed to produce the rent deeds to show when the rooms were let out. He has also failed to examine any of the tenants. Incidentally, this Court also referred to Exts.A5 and A6 documents. So, the contention of the petitioner that the finding in the order under review was entered mainly based on the said documents, is not correct. Even if those documents are ignored, still the review petitioner has failed to prove when the rooms owned by him were let out to the tenants. So, no ground has been made out to review our order. No other point was urged.

In the result, the R.P is dismissed.

**K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, JUDGE.**

**K.T.SANKARAN, JUDGE.**

Nm/